

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

As the Examiner is aware, this case is part of an original "bulk filing" by Motorola. Special IDS procedures have been approved for these cases, and in this case several 1449's have kindly been considered. A supplemental IDS filing was included with the last filing, which has been considered.

The claims have been amended as requested. Claim 144 specifies that the pervoskite oxide material layer contacts the amorphous oxide material layer.

The claims have been rejected over Calviello, Guenzer and/or Mantl. This rejection is traversed.

It would not have been obvious to substitute an amorphous buffer in Calviello. What Calviello teaches is that his "buffer layer" of, e.g., SrTiO_3 , "is single crystalline with ceramic substrate 12." See col. 2, lines 45-46 of the reference referring to Figure 2 therein. It would be antithetical to the reference's teaching to substitute in an amorphous buffer, as this would violate both the basic nature of the reference buffer as well as the relationship between the reference buffer and substrate. The noted passage in Guenzer, cited in support of the rejection, refers to the growth of silicon on BTO, not vice versa: "[t]he epitaxial growth of Si over BTO should present few problems and few variations from the usual processes for epitaxial silicon growth." See col. 2, lines 64-66 (emphasis added). Finally, the mixed crystals formed on the amorphous layer in Mantl are not monocrystalline perovskite oxides. In fact, they are not even oxides. See, e.g., Examples 1 and 2 where a Si-Ge film is deposited (Ex.1) and a cobalt silicide film is formed (Ex. 2).

Because the references fail to motivate one of ordinary skill in the art towards the presently claimed invention Applicants submit that this case in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Application No. 09/986,034
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2005

With regard to the double patenting rejection, the Office is kindly holding these rejections in abeyance until the indication of allowable subject matter. In this regard, Applicant is now preparing their response to the double patenting rejections in this series of cases, which is expected to address all such rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Richard L. Treanor
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 36,379

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)